

**BUTTE COUNTY  
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES COMMISSION  
Friday, September 20, 2002  
Minutes**

Held at the Mira Loma Drive county offices, the meeting was called to order at 8:46 a.m.

Item 1: Introductions & Agenda Review

Commissioners present: Chair Patricia Cragar, Jane Dolan, Marian Gage, Mark Lundberg, Sandra Machida, Karen Marlatt, Linda Moore, and Gene Smith.

Commissioners absent: Gary House.

Staff present: Cheryl Giscombe, and Eva Puciata.

Staff absent: None.

Item 8 was discussed while waiting for Item 5's presenter.

Item 2: Approval of Draft August 23, 2002 Minutes

**Marian Gage moved to approve the minutes as written. Sandra Machida seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Item 4: Administration Committee Report

Cheryl Giscombe said the primary focus of the Administration Committee meeting were the Draft Financial Plan (FP) Narrative and Scenarios. The agenda for today's meeting was also reviewed, and Staff requested guidance on developing policy for non-or low-performing grantees. The committee deferred the later issue to the Contract Awards Committee.

Item 8: Strategic Plan Commissioner Committee Report

Marian Gage said financial planning brought up the necessity of reviewing priorities, so the Strategic Plan (SP) Committee and partners met to clarify priority definitions. They looked at the work the Commission had done to get to priorities, and what was meant by them. They went through each priority area and made recommendations.

There are two overarching recommendations. One, we need to reflect back to the SP to see what was meant by the priority areas (these are color-coded in the packet handout). For example, the preliminary priority area "Comprehensive Health," would also mean all the SP areas highlighted in green. Two, each of our five priority areas need to address Service Integration and Collaboration, School Readiness, and a Whole Child Focus. These should be like a lens to look through at priorities.

The SP Committee intent was to more narrowly focus priorities, but in a sense opened them up more. Each priority area was examined and definitions expanded to be more comprehensive. A proposal would not have to respond to all of the definition. Priority areas were defined as such:

*Comprehensive, prevention oriented health care*, is screenings, treatment, continuity of services, consistent primary care physician (i.e. medical home where education, preventative treatment, and referrals are accessible) that supports, but not limited, to timely prenatal care, proper immunizations, alcohol, drug, and tobacco prevention, intervention, and treatment services, and oral/dental care.

*Diagnostic assessment*, change heading to: *Comprehensive developmental screening and assessments*, meaning a "whole child" comprehensive screening and/or assessment that addresses social, emotional, cognitive and physical development.

*Family Based Mental Health Services*, heading change to: *Family Based Mental Health and Social Services*, meaning family-based mental health and social services that focus on emotional and behavioral health, including addictive and domestic violent behaviors.

*Outreach to families*, through education, services, and resources, including children in informal care.

*Professional Development*, change heading to: *Early care and education providers, staffing and professional development*, meaning, to build on the skills and knowledge of all adults who care for and educate children (other than their own), enhancing the professionalism of the field through recognition, training, and compensation.

Heather Senske said the phrase, "other than their own," is exclusive. The LPC thought a definition should be inclusive of informal caregivers, including parents. Cheryl read LPC's definition: "Build on the skills and knowledge of adults who care for and educate young children, enhancing the quality of early care education and professionalism of the field, including compensation and training opportunities."

The LPC is recommending taking "other than their own" out, and including "Enhancing the quality of the service provision."

Gene said the phrase "other than their own" was borrowed from the State's proposed pre-K-12 Master Plan for Education. It was included to parallel the proposed legislation.

Linda said parents are included in the Outreach to Parents focus area.

Karen Marlatt said families of children with disabilities are being left out in the SP Committee's definition. Children with disabilities are often cared for almost exclusively by their parents, and the LPC's definition includes them. It was decided take LPC's recommendation.

Further discussion/action on expanding priority area definitions was postponed to the October monthly meeting due agenda time limits.

#### Item 5: DRAFT Financial Plan Scenario and Narrative – Continued from August Meeting, Discussion Facilitated by Prop 10 TASC Consultant, Barbara Riley

Barbara Riley said her presentation will touch on the areas in the BCCFC Draft FP that are most likely to generate discussion. She would highlight our accomplishments thus far. This had been one of her easiest assignments, because BCCFC staff did all the work. Bobbi's role is overseer, editor, and coach.

The first few items in the plan are background. One of the most important items is the Financial Plan goal. Staff wrote: "The main goal of the financial plan is strictly tied to providing the guiding financial framework for ensuring long-term sustainability to the most successful and effective programs developed and supported with Prop 10, including a consistent level of funding over 10 years."

Barbara asked if everyone agreed with the goal, which is similar to others around the State. 1.5 million is an amount we can commit to for 10 years without going out of business. Most counties are going with a level funding. Although our funding will decline, a level funding level out to the community gives them some confidence. Of course, this can be impacted: if the tobacco tax comes back, etc.

With what information we have now, this is a good plan, consistent with what other counties are doing. Using a larger decline in revenues would be ultraconservative and shortchanging the community. Next year we may have to make some changes, depending on what actually happens.

Gene emphasized the FP does not authorize or appropriate funding. It is a guiding framework. It is a tool to support the SP and will be revisited yearly. Marian said we have an ability to fund, but that does not mean we will allocate the entire 1.5 million to grants. The language needs to be changed to say, "could include grants." Barbara suggested saying "1.5 million for programs," or **"1.5 millions for grants, effective programs, new initiatives, or as match to available State funding."**

The objectives of the plan are on page 6. We'll **change number one to say "a consistent level of funding for Programs."** Some money is earmarked for evaluation. Operating Expenses have been capped at 05/06 levels. Barbara asked if there are additional objectives, or other changes.

Barbara went on to explain the principles of the FP, how we are going to use the FP. Our annual budget and funding allocation plans will be constructed using the FP's numeric and narrative information. The FP will be updated annually to reflect actual expenditures and revenues, and assumptions will be validated and corrected. Changes to the plan require Commission approval. Any budget surplus funds will become part of the fund balance. A potential deficit in an annual budget will be handled as soon as identified, by reducing variable expenses and utilizing Evaluation results to prioritize any further reductions. Only if there is a drastic decline in Prop 10 funds will there be a deficit risk.

Other counties are using budget surpluses in varied ways: to exceed the admin. cap, as a strategic reserve to fund commission directed initiatives, or just setting it aside for future discussion. For a county our size, not much would be gained by putting money into a technical "reserve." By putting our surplus into the fund balance, it can be allocated where needed.

Leveraged funds will be treated as surplus until there is cash flow history. Leveraged funds are such as MAA (Title 19), and matched funds. In-kind is a type of leveraging, but does not bring in new dollars. True leveraging is bringing in new money. The Commission staff time is MAA claimable. MAA monies would show up in our revenues after a history is proven. Federal leveraged dollars have to be earned as we go.

Jane Dolan said leveraged funds usually show up in the grantee budget. Too much staff time would be needed to include all the dollars in our budget. Leveraged funds that grantees are able to receive should perhaps, show in our annual report. Leveraged dollars will only come back into the Prop 10 budget when funding community providers, not public providers, as we'd have to upfront total costs for community providers, and then they'd pay us back when they get the funds from the other agency.

Mark Lundberg said our FP already lists leveraged revenues: REWARD funds from the State, REWARD funds from TANF through DESS, and School Readiness funds from the State.

The FP will be updated annually. Objectives and principles of the plan will be reviewed no less than tri-annually. A conservative approach will be used in forecasting.

Economic assumptions used in developing the plan are: 5% annual decline in Prop 10 funds, 4% interest earnings, 2.5% inflation for operating expenses, and salaries and benefits are inflated 6%. A decline in program funding is built in, because the 1.5 million is not inflated.

Linda voiced concern that School Readiness and Project REWARD just end. It was explained the definitions that we are working on would guide our funding allocation. REWARD would be considered under the "Professional Development" heading. The FP is reflective of what is known now: the State's SR and Cares initiatives end. Our FP will be revisited annually to update to our needs.

Staff provided a detailed worksheet to show how strategic plan priorities might fit together with the 1.5 million available, and how much of the admin. costs might be leveragible. Marian said tough decisions will have to be made, as, for example, only half the monies in this year's budget will be available for professional development (REWARD) in future years.

Sandra said from Evaluation, we'll be able to determine what should and what should not be continued. This FP shows it won't be until 04/05 until monies are available for more spending. Having this amount of lead-time may be the proper timing to get all the background work necessary to an RFP say, done, as it takes us forever to get things out.

Mark said funding allocation percentages were arbitrarily derived. During the May meeting lunch at the Southside Community Center, some Commissioners did not put much thought into the percentages from which preliminary funding allocations were calculated, **so these figures need to be looked at again.**

The next steps are to approve the Draft Financial Plan, with the corrections we agreed to make. Then a funding allocation plan can be worked out.

Barbara again commended Butte County Commission Staff for putting together a viable document, and recommended her new book on leveraging and passed out samples.

**Barbara Riley will be coming up again, perhaps in several months, to provide a workshop on leveraging.**

**Marian Gage moved to approve the Financial Plan Draft with the agreed changes. Sandra Machida seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Item 6: Community Health Care Ordinance Presentation, Paul McIntosh, Butte County CAO

Paul McIntosh said the Community Health Care Ordinance (CHCO) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) on August 13, 2002, and went into effect on September 13, 2002 of this year. The purpose of the CHCO is not to affect the business of the BCCFC, but is meant to enhance it. Not to contradict, but to complement.

Paul said when Measure G was placed on the ballot; the BOS thought citizens wished to have more efforts for tobacco prevention. Butte County already does a lot; \$8 million dollars will be spent this year on tobacco cessation efforts. What is missing is a coordination of the efforts.

The ordinance is a direct alternative to Measure G. Adopting the ordinance is the BOS's attempt to be responsive to citizens seeking tobacco cessation and healthcare, and to have public accountability for tax dollars in a manner that maintains flexibility over time.

Paul said there are four sections to the Community Health Care Ordinance. Section one is a statement of intent, section two creates the Tobacco Monies Advisory Commission, section three provides for tobacco monies accountability and coordination of programs and services, and section four provides for five-year plan review and change.

Paul said the ordinance is presented as an alternative to Measure G on the Nov. ballot, and then compared the aspects of the ordinance and the aspects of Measure G in a slide presentation.

Mark said some of the Measure G literature he has seen says that the Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) monies are supposed to be used in a non-discretionary way. Paul said that the MSA states monies are discretionary to each jurisdiction receiving the monies, and he confirmed this with the Attorney General's office.

Marian said she was concerned that our request for a presentation was unclear. A presentation concerning the relationship of the ordinance to the Prop 10 Commission was requested. We've heard pros of the ordinance, and she voiced discomfort because we didn't ask proponents of Measure G to address their side.

Marian said the ordinance language describing Prop 10 seems to say Prop 10 was created to provide tobacco prevention focused services. The public may see this and be confused. The intent of Prop 10 is to use the tobacco tax to provide children 0-5 services.

Another two things of concern are, the new Commission has similar charges as this Commission: accountability, oversight of tax dollars, etc., and there is no school representative on the new Commission.

Patricia said that she saw it as one and the same.

Linda said she hasn't seen anything on Measure G. She thought she understood it, but now she's confused about the relationship.

Paul said he's just here to present information and is not advocating one position over the other. Prop 10 does encourage parents with young children to quit smoking.

Gene shares Marian's concern with the language. The cited language in the ordinance by omission says Prop 10 is exclusively for funding tobacco specific services. It miss-defines the scope of work of this Commission. As he reads the ordinance, the new Commission will only be advising us as to that portion of funding that we have allocated for tobacco specific services.

Paul said the purpose of the new commission will be to coordinate and complement the work of the BCCFC, not to duplicate, not to replicate, not to change. It is to provide that comprehensive look at how we're addressing tobacco use and tobacco prevention.

Marian asked how that would look like. Paul said the BCCFC SP would be incorporated into the Tobacco Monies Advisory Commission. The purpose of the Commission is to provide a coordinating link. We can benefit from more info as to what we all are doing, to create more effective use of the monies.

Marian asked how would it look like for the schools. Will there be a coordinating link to Prop 99? There is no school rep on the commission. Jane said schools are an independent entity. The County ordinance does not have oversight over the schools, and only calls for communication and coordination with the Prop 99 monies, not oversight. Input would be done in a public framework.

Marian asked if Gary House would be the link between commissions. Jane said only if this Commission would wish him to play the dual roles. There is no seat on the new Commission for this Commission because this Commission is independent.

Sandra pointed out wording describing what county commissions fund is inaccurate. Only a portion of our funds go towards tobacco specific services, not all, as inferred in the ordinance.

Marian made a motion that we ask for a revision on how Prop 10 is stated in the ordinance and recommend that we have an additional (besides Gary) representative on the new commission. Linda Moore seconded. There was discussion and it was decided to split the motion.

**Marian Gage made a motion to ask for a revision in the description of Prop 10 in the Community Health Care Ordinance. Sandra Machida seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Marian Gage made a motion to ask for a seat for another Prop 10 Commissioner on the new Tobacco Advisory Commission. Linda Moore seconded. The vote was 3 for; 4 against, 1 abstained, and it was decided to discuss the matter at a later meeting.**

Marian asked Paul what the relationship between the two Commissions will be, and recited: Input into their SP; the new Commission will make recommendations to us; they will create an annual report with our input; and we're not sure how it's going to happen so it's not duplicative.

Paul said we should be complementing one another, not doing the same thing.

Gene said the ordinance has little to do with what the Prop 10 Commission does, and thanked Paul for clarification on the competing issues.

Patricia asked for public comment. Phyllis Bond, from the American Cancer Society and the Tobacco Prevention Coalition, said the Coalition is hoping to make a presentation to the Commission on Oct. 18, regarding what monies are coming into Butte County and what is being spent where. She said she respectfully disagrees with parts of Mr. McIntosh's presentation, and she would be happy to come back to another meeting and present the other side, as today's report was one-sided.

Patricia thanked Paul McIntosh for coming.

Mark asked who would write the language to be presented to the BOS for inclusion in the ordinance, Cheryl? Patricia said Cheryl would write the language for presentation to the Commission at the next meeting, for agreement before forwarding to the BOS. The next agenda also needs time for discussion regarding another Prop 10 (besides Gary) Commissioner be seated on the Tobacco Monies Advisory Commission. Marian said we also need time to hear Measure G's side.

The meeting broke for a bio-break at 10:55 and resumed at 11:15a.m.

#### Item 7: Project REWARD Report

Heather Senske and Jenny Sharkey presented. Heather said the intention was to reach 635 early care and education providers. There were 440 applicants and 419 of them qualified.

A flyer was distributed showing how many qualified applicants came from what program type: Child Care Centers 367, Family Child Care Homes 58, Public School Programs 8, and Tribal Entities 7. Most stipends were issued to Teachers and Site Supervisors. Only 52 Associate Teachers qualified, many more are in the field but did not qualify.

Mark asked what the qualifications were to receive a stipend. Jenny said for step one, applicants had to have either 12 ECE units or 160 hours of professional development; from there, ECE units increase. Step 5 is people who have a BA degree, including ECE units, two administration classes, and an adult supervision class.

Linda said providers had to be working at least 9 months in one place. 12 units of ECE and/or a combination of professional development hours were considered. Heather explained criteria were based on the Child Development Permit Matrix.

Marian asked why a low level of Associate Teachers qualified. Sandra said Aides and Associate Teachers only have to have 6 units of ECE to work. Project REWARDS set the bar high. Marian said maybe the bar should be set lower to be more inclusive. The State set minimum standards at 6 units. Butte County has an educated populace, so the bar was set high at 12 units.

Linda said the 9-month period at one place was a factor also. Lots of the workers hop around.

Gene asked at what step of the stipend levels were the Family Childcare Providers. The data is not evaluated yet, but Jenny's guess is from a very minimal education a BA degree, so step one or step five.

Some providers got extra stipends: those working with children under three, those who use bilingual skills in their work, those working with special needs children, and those working in the same program for five years or more. Providers could qualify for up to two additional stipends. 704 additional stipends were issued, at \$250 each. 406 participants qualified for additional stipends.

A total of \$579,750.00 was distributed. The stipend increase averages out to only about 75 cents per hour, but it made an impact. Linda said it's not the money, but that providers are being recognized. Commissioners should contact the State and let them know REWARDS is working. Money is needed to continue this program. To receive money next June, providers have to take a 3-unit class or take 40 hours of professional development.

Sixty people contacted Jenny for career counseling. She's advised what classes to take and helped them find classes that fit into their schedules, including distance (internet) learning. Many work during the day, and have a family of their own to take care of at night. Even people who have been working the field for years are taking classes and learning. All night classes at Butte are full. There are waiting lists. Daily there are calls for info regarding online education.

Jenny said just providing opportunities for childcare providers to get together and share brings quality enhancement to the field.

Jenny introduced Steve Erwin. Steve graduated from CSU with a degree in Early Child Development, and has been in the field for 27 years. He gives a lot of ECE trainings, and was surprised by the turnout at a recent GRAEYC early childhood training. Project REWARDS is providing school readiness through teacher readiness, enhancing the interaction between caregiver and child, a key quality indicator.

Heather talked about the PACE evaluation. Butte County is one of eight selected to participate in a statewide evaluation. Marian asked if the statewide evaluation gets down to the child level. It will look at the intended outcomes of the State Commission, retention and compensation. This initiative was a great collaboration and service integration piece.

Patricia asked presenters to request another agenda placement, to inform on how to lobby the State to continue REWARD funding. Also, the SP Committee's discussion was not finished; continuation will be put on a future agenda. Commissioners were asked to bring their calendars, as lots needs to be accomplished between now and the end of the year.

#### Item 9: Open Comments and Closure

Jeanie Maes, PHN, Public Health Nursing, left a flyer concerning the Oroville Homeless Conference on Saturday, Sept. 21, 2002, 9 to noon. Children comprise 25% of the homeless.

Anna Dove, Public Health Tobacco Prevention Program Supervisor, voiced concern over BCCFC mini-grant grading procedures, feeling their grant deserved a much higher score, considering that benchmark goals were far exceeded.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Minutes by Eva Puciata.